

**PATENT**  
App. Ser. No.: 10/039,017  
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010189US1  
PS Ref. No.: IBMK10189

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated October 13, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on January 13, 2006. Applicants submit this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-15, 18-29 and 31-33 are pending in the application. Claims 1-15, 18-29 and 31-33 remain pending following entry of this response.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 10-14, 18-29, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jang et al.* (US Pat 5,548,546, hereinafter *Jang '546*).

Claims 1-7, 10-14, 18-29, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jang et al.* (US Pat 5,912,833, hereinafter *Jang '833*).

Claims 1-7, 10-14, 18-29, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Muramatsu et al.* (US Pat 6,832,235, hereinafter *Muramatsu*).

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143.

The present rejection fails to establish at least the third criterion. For example, none of the references teaches stalling at least one stage of a pipelined circuit by one or more clock cycles in response to a produced carry out signal, to account for additional delay when the carry out signal indicates a carry, as recited in independent claims 1, 11, 18, 21, 27, and 31-32.

**PATENT**  
App. Ser. No.: 10/039,017  
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010189US1  
PS Ref. No.: IBMK10189

Regarding *Jang* '546 and *Jang* '833, the Examiner admits there is no explicit teaching this claimed feature in either reference, but argues that such a feature is "implicitly disclosed from the Figures and the corresponding recitation" in each. Applicant submits, however, that neither reference makes any mention of pipelined circuits whatsoever. Accordingly, Applicant submits that there is certainly no implicit disclosure of stalling at least one stage of a pipelined circuit in response to a carry out signal, as claimed.

Regarding *Muramatsu*, the Examiner again admits there is no explicit teaching of the claimed feature in this reference, but argues that such a feature is "merely a basic component in the electronic device for buffer/store the desire data in the pipelined computation processing." Applicant submits, however, that *Muramatsu* makes no mention of pipelined circuits whatsoever and further submits that the Examiner has no basis to conclude that the claimed features are a basic component of any component taught in *Muramatsu*.

While the Examiner cites portions of *Patti* (US Pat 5,047,975) and *Virtue* (US Pat 5,036,483) several times in the Office Action, Applicant submits these references also fail to teach stalling a pipeline stage in response to a carry out signal, whether taken separately or in combination with any of the references mentioned above.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**PATENT**  
App. Ser. No.: 10/039,017  
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010189US1  
PS Ref. No.: IBMK10189

**Conclusion**

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, as stated above, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Gero McClellan, attorney of record, at (336) 643-3065, or the undersigned attorney to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Randol W. Read, Reg. No. 43,876/

Randol W. Read  
Registration No. 43,876  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicants

Page 12

418701\_1